

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-13, 15, 17-21 and 23-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2, 14, 16 and 22 are canceled, claims 1, 6-7, 13, 15 and 17 are amended and claims 24-27 are added. Support for new claims 24-27 can be found in the specification including the original claims and the figures, for example, see pages 10-12. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**I. 35 U.S.C. §103(a)****A. Butterworth et al. in view of Sawai et al.**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 5-11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Butterworth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,722) (hereafter "Butterworth") in view of Sawai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,862) (hereafter "Sawai"). Since Butterworth and Sawai, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Butterworth appears disclose an optical display system, as illustrated in Figure 2 of Butterworth, which includes an optical train 16 which has a light pipe 36. However, the light pipe 36 does not include an optical input surface with an area greater than an optical output surface. Rather, Butterworth appears to disclose a light pipe that is uniformly cylindrical.

Sawai fails to cure this deficiency. Applicant respectfully submits that Sawai appears to disclose an image display device which includes, as illustrated in Figure 17 of Sawai, a

kaleidoscope 112 which appears to be uniformly cylindrical in shape. However, Sawai fails to disclose or suggest, similar to Butterworth, at least a feature recited in claim 1, of a rod lens with an optical input surface with an area greater than an optical output surface and combinations thereof.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2 and 14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot. Claims 5-11 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as their added features and the combinations thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**B. Sawai in view of Butterworth**

The Office Action rejects claims 15-18 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sawai in view of Butterworth. Since Butterworth and Sawai, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 recites, similar to claim 1, a rod lens with an optical input surface with an area greater than an optical output surface. As such, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that Butterworth and Sawai do not disclose or suggest at least this feature.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable. Claims 16 and 22 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot. Claims 17-18, 21 and 23 depend from claim 15, and are

allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as their added features and the combinations thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**C. Sawai in view Gleckman**

The Office Action rejects claims 15, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sawai in view of Gleckman (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,105). Since Sawai and Gleckman, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 15, Sawai fails to disclose or suggest all the features of the claims. Gleckman fails to cure these deficiencies. Applicant respectfully submits that Gleckman appears to disclose a color projection system which includes a rotatable color drum with reflective segments on the surface of the drum. However, Gleckman, like Sawai, fails to disclose or suggest, as recited in claim 15, at least the feature of a rod lens with an optical input surface with an area greater than an optical output surface.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable. Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 15, and are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as their added features and the combinations thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**D. Butterworth and Sawai in Further View of Dove et al.**

The Office Action rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Butterworth and Sawai in further view of Dove et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,082,861) (hereafter “Dove”). Since the references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features of the claim, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits for at least the reasons set forth above, Butterworth and Sawai, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at the features of claim 1, from which claim 13 depends. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Butterworth and Sawai fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 13. Dove fails to cure the deficiencies. Applicant respectfully submits that Dove appears to disclose an optical system for high contrast projection displays. However, similar Butterworth and Sawai, Dove also fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of claim 1 mentioned above.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13, which depends from claim 1, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as its added features and the combination thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**E. Butterworth and Sawai in Further View of Doany**

The Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Butterworth and Sawai in further of Doany (U.S. Patent No. 5,863,125). Since the references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 12 which depends from claim 1, is not disclosed or suggested by Butterworth or Sawai. Doany fails to cure the deficiencies of Butterworth and Sawai. Applicant respectfully submits that Doany appears to disclose a high efficiency projector, as illustrated in Figure 7 of Doany, which includes a polarizer 450. However, Doany, similar to Butterworth and Sawai, fails to disclose or suggest at least the features mentioned above with respect to claim 1 from which claim 12 depends.

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable as it depends from claim 1, as well as its added features and the combination thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## **II. NEW CLAIMS 24-27**

By this Amendment, claims 24-27 are added to the application. Claims 24-27 broadly recite features of the preferred embodiment(s). It is respectfully submitted that the new claims are allowable over the references of record for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claims 1, 3-13, 15, 17-21 and 23.

## **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Laura L. Lee**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski  
Registration No. 40,372  
Laura L. Lee  
Registration No. 48,752

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200  
703 502-9440 CRW/LLL:jld  
**Date: February 7, 2003**